Catuṣkoṭi

Catuṣkoṭi (Sanskrit; Devanagari: चतुष्कोटि, Tibetan: མུ་བཞི, Wylie: *mu bzhi*, Sinhalese:චතුස්කෝටිකය) refers to logical argument(s) of a 'suite of four discrete functions' or 'an indivisible quaternity' that has multiple

applications and has been important in the Indian logic and the Buddhist logico-epistemological traditions, particularly those of the Madhyamaka school.

In particular, the catuṣkoṭi is a "four-cornered" system of argumentation that involves the systematic examination of each of the 4 possibilities of a proposition, *P*:

1. *P*; that is being.
2. not *P*; that is not being.
3. *P* and not *P*; that is being and that is not being.
4. not (*P* or not *P*); that is neither not being nor is that being.

These four statements hold the following properties: (1) each alternative is mutually exclusive (that is, one of, but no more than one of, the four

statements is true) and (2) that all the alternatives are together exhaustive (that is, at least one of them must necessarily be true).[1] This system of logic not only provides a novel method of classifying propositions into logical alternatives, but also because it does so in such a manner that the alternatives are not dependent on the number of truth-values assumed in the system of logic.[1]

An example of a *Catuṣkoṭi* using the arbitrary proposition, "Animals understand love" as *P* would be:

1. Animals understand love
2. Animals do not understand love
3. Animals both do and do not understand love
4. Animals neither do nor do not understand love

History

Nasadiya Sukta

Statements similar to the tetra lemma seems to appear in the nasadiya sukta (famous creation hymn), trying to inquire on the question of creation but was not used as a significant tool of logic before buddhism.[2]

Early Buddhism

Śākyamuni, as remembered by Ānanda and codified in the *Brahmajala Sutta* 2.27, when expounding the sixteenth wrong view, or the fourth wrong view of the 'Eel-Wrigglers' (Pali: amarā-vikheppikā), the non-committal equivocators who adhered to Ajñana, the sceptical philosophy, though the grammatical structure is

identical to the Catuṣkoṭi (and there are numerous other analogues of this fourfold grammatical structure within this Sutta), the intentionality of the architecture employed by Nagarjuna is not evident, as rendered into English by Walshe (1987, 1995: p. 81):

> *'What is the fourth way? Here, an ascetic or Brahmin is dull and*

stupid. Because of his dullness and stupidity, when he is questioned he resorts to evasive statements and wriggles like an eel: "If you ask me whether there is another world. But I don't say so. And I don't say otherwise. And I don't say it is not, and I don't not say it is

not." "Is there no other world?..." "Is there both another world and no other world?..."Is there neither another world nor no other world?..." "Are there spontaneously-born beings?..." "Are there not...?" "Both...? "Neither...?" "Does the Tathagata exist after

death? Does he not exist after death? Does he both exist and not exist after death? Does he neither exist nor not exist after death?..." "If I thought so, I would say so...I don't say so...I don't say it is not." This is the fourth case." [3]

Pyrrhonism

McEvilley (2002: p. 495) makes a case for mutual iteration and pervasion between Pyrrhonism and Madhyamika:

> *An extraordinary similarity, that has long been noticed, between Pyrrhonism and Mādhyamika is the formula known in*

> *connection with Buddhism as the fourfold negation (catuṣkoṭi) and which in Pyrrhonic form might be called the fourfold indeterminacy.*[4]

Nagarjuna

The Catuṣkoṭi was employed particularly by Nagarjuna who developed it and engaged it as

a 'learning, investigative, meditative'[5] portal to realize the 'openness' (Sanskrit: Śūnyatā), of Shakyamuni's Second Turning of the Dharmacakra, as categorized by the *Sandhinirmocana Sutra*.

Robinson (1957: p. 294), building on the foundations of Liebenthal (1948)[6] to whom he gives credit, states:

What Nagarjuna wishes to prove is the irrationality of Existence, or the falsehood of reasoning which is built upon the logical principle that A equals A.... Because two answers, assertion and denial, are always possible to a given

> *question, his arguments contain two refutations, one denying the presence, one the absence of the probandum.* ***This double refutation is called the Middle Path.*** *[emphasis evident in Robinson]*[7]

Śūnyatā is the ninth 'view' (Sanskrit: dṛṣṭi), the viewless view, a superposition of the eight possible arrays of proposition P [and its 'inseparable contradistinction' (Sanskrit: apoha)].

Positive configuration	*Negative configuration*
1. **P**	1. **Not (P)**
2. **Not-P**	2. **Not (Not-P)**
3. **Both P and Not-P**	3. **Not (Both P and Not-P)**
4. **Neither P nor Not-P**	4. **Not (Neither**

P nor Not-P)

The eight arrays or octaves of the iconographic Dharmacakra represent drishti or traditional views that Shakyamuni countered. These eight arrays may be plotted as coordinates on a multidimensional field which may be rendered as a sphere, a mandala, a multidimensional shunya or

zero where shunyata denotes zero-ness. The eight arrays are in a concordant relationship where they each constitute a chord to the sphere. The coordinates are equidistant from the epicentre of shunya where the array of the positive configuration (or hemisphere) and the array of the negative configuration (or hemisphere) constitute two polar radii or diametrical complements, a

diameter in sum. These are the 'eight limits' (Wylie: mtha' brgyad; Sanskrit: aṣṭānta) of 'openness' (Sanskrit: śūnyatā),[8] where śūnyatā is amplified by 'freedom from constructs' or 'simplicity' (Wylie: spros bral; Sanskrit: aprapañca).[9][10] Karmay (1988: p. 118) conveys that 'spros bral' is a homologue of 'thig le' (Sanskrit: bindu), where 'spros bral' is literally "without

amplification", understood as "that which cannot be displayed".[11]

1. P is true ``1 P is not true or Not P is true
2. Not P is true ``2. Not (Not P) is true i.e. P is true
3. Both P and Not P are true i.e. the universal set `` 3 Neither P nor not P are true i.e. it is a null set

4. Neither P nor not P are true it is a null set `` 4. Not (neither p nor not P are true) = both P and not P are true which is the universal set.

Thus, we can see that there are only 4 alternatives available and the negative alternatives are mere rewritten alternatives.

In other words, it makes no difference whether you are working with positive

configuration or negative configuration.

More over, if you replace P with not P, then the positive configuration set for not P will be the same as negative configuration of P.

Sanjaya Belatthiputta, a 6th century BCE Indian ascetic whose teachings are similar to that of Nagarjuna are compared to that of a "theory of

eel-wrigglers" in the famous Samannaphala Sutta (DN 2).[12][13] Sanjaya is recorded as saying:

> 'If you ask me if there exists another world [after death], if I thought that there exists another world, would I declare that to you? I don't think so. I don't think in that way. I don't think otherwise. I don't think not. I don't think not not. If

you asked me if there isn't another world... both is and isn't... neither is nor isn't... if there are beings who transmigrate... if there aren't... both are and aren't... neither are nor aren't... if the Tathagata exists after death... doesn't... both... neither exists nor exists after death, would I declare that to you? I don't think so. I don't think in that way. I don't think otherwise. I

don't think not. I don't think not not.'[14]

Catuṣkoṭi post-Nagarjuna

The Catuṣkoṭi, following Nagarjuna, has had a profound impact upon the development of Buddhist logic and its dialectical refinement of Tibetan Buddhism.

Robinson (1957: p. 294) qualifies the import of

Nagarjuna's work (which includes Nagarjuna's application of the Catuskoti) due to the embedded noise in the scholarly lineage: "Certainly some of Nagarjuna's ancient opponents were just as confused as his modern interpreters...".[7] This noise may also have co-arisen with Nagarjuna, following the work of Jayatilleke (1967).

Modern interpretations

Robinson (1957: p. 294)[15] holds that Stcherbatsky (1927),[16] opened a productive period in Madhyamaka studies. Schayer (1933)[17] made a departure into the rules of inference employed by early Buddhist dialecticians and examines the Catuskoti (Tetralemma) as an attribute of

propositional logic and critiques Stcherbatsky. Robinson (1957: p. 294)[15] states that "Schayers criticisms of Stcherbatsky are incisive and just." Murti (1955)[18] makes no mention of the logical contribution of Schayer. According to Robinson (1957: p. 294),[15] Murti furthered the work of Stcherbatsky amongst others, and brought what Robinson terms "the

metaphysical phase of investigation" to its apogee though qualifies this with: "Murti has a lot to say about 'dialectic,' but practically nothing to say about formal logic." Robinson (1957: p. 294)[15] opines that Nakamura (1954),[19] developed Schayer's methodology and defended and progressed its application.

Robinson (1957: p. 293) opines that the 'metaphysical approach' evident foremost in Murti (1955) was not founded in a firm understanding of the 'logical structure of the system', i.e. catuskoti, for example:

> *Several fundamental limitations of the metaphysical approach are now apparent. It has tried to find*

> *comprehensive answers without knowing the answers to the more restricted questions involved - such questions as those of the epistemological and logical structure of the system.*[20]

Robinson (1957: p. 296) conveys his focus and states his methodology, clearly

identifying the limitations in scope of this particular publication, which he testifies is principally built upon, though divergent from, the work of Nakamura:

> *In considering the formal structure of Nagarjuna's argumentation, I exclude epistemology, psychology, and*

> *ontology from consideration.... Such extra-logical observations as emerge will be confined to the concluding paragraphs...*[21]

Exegesis

Puhakka (2003: p. 134-145) charts the stylized reification process of a human sentient

being, the spell of reality,[22] a spell dispelled by the Catuṣkoṭi:

> *We are typically not aware of ourselves as taking something (P) as real. Rather, its reality "takes us," or already has us in its spell as soon as we become aware of its identity (P). Furthermore, it's*

impossible to take something (P) to be real without, at least momentarily, ignoring or denying that which it is not (not-P). Thus the act of taking something as real necessarily involves some degree of unconsciousness or lack of awareness. This is true even in the simple

act of perception when we see a figure that we become aware of as "something." As the German gestalt psychologists demonstrated, for each figure perceived, there is a background of which we remain relatively unaware. We can extend this to texts

or spoken communications. For every text we understand there is a context we are not fully cognizant of. Thus, with every figure noticed or reality affirmed, there is, inevitably, unawareness. Is this how a spell works? It takes us unawares.[23]

Catuṣkoṭi paradox: a simple complex

Wayman (1977) proffers that the Catuṣkoṭi may be employed in different ways and often these are not clearly stated in discussion nor the tradition. Wayman (1977) holds that the Catuṣkoṭi may be applied in suite, that is all are applicable to a given topic forming a paradoxical matrix; or they may

be applied like trains running on tracks (or employing another metaphor, four mercury switches where only certain functions or switches are employed at particular times). This difference in particular establishes a distinction with the Greek tradition of the Tetralemma. Also, predicate logic has been applied to the Dharmic Tradition, and though this in some quarters has

established interesting correlates and extension of the logico-mathematical traditions of the Greeks, it has also obscured the logico-grammatical traditions of the Dharmic Traditions of Catuṣkoṭi within modern English discourse.

Four Extremes

The 'Four Extremes' (Tibetan: མཐའ་བཞི, Wylie: *mtha' bzhi*;

Sanskrit: caturanta; Devanagari: चतुरन्त) [24] is a particular application of the Catuṣkoṭi:

- Being (Wylie: yod)
- Non-being (Wylie: med)
- Both being and non-being (Wylie: yod-med)
- Neither being nor non-being (Wylie: yod-med min)[24]

Dumoulin *et al.*'s (1988, 2005: pp. 43–44), work on Zen models a particular formulation

of the Catuṣkoṭi that approaches the Caturanta engaging the Buddhist notion of dharmas, and attribute the model to Nagarjuna:

> *If we focus on the doctrinal agreement that exists between the Wisdom Sūtras*[25] *and the tracts of the Mādhyamika we note that both schools*

characteristically practice a didactic negation. By setting up a series of self-contradictory oppositions, Nāgārjuna disproves all conceivable statements, which can be reduced to these four:

All things (dharmas) exist: affirmation of being, negation of nonbeing

All things (dharmas) do not exist: affirmation of nonbeing, negation of being

All things (dharmas) both exist and do not

exist: both affirmation and negation
All things (dharmas) neither exist nor do not exist: neither affirmation nor negation

With the aid of these four alternatives (catuṣkoṭika: affirmation, negation,

double affirmation, double negation), Nāgārjuna rejects all firm standpoints and traces a middle path between being and nonbeing. Most likely the eight negations, arranged in couplets in Chinese, can be traced back to Nāgārjuna: neither destruction nor

> *production, neither annihilation nor permanence, neither unity nor difference, neither coming nor going.*[26]

Alternate Four Limits/Four Extremes

A Mantrayana enumeration of the Four Limits or the Four Extremes within the Buddhadharma is also

common. These four limits are evident in the earliest sutras of the Theravadin of the First Turning, through the Second Turning philosophy of Nagarjuna and his disciples and commentators and also evident in the Third Turning as evidenced in the presentation of Padmasambhava. Padmasambhava in his "Secret Instruction in a Garland of Vision" Tibetan: མན་ངག་ལྷ་བའི་

སྨོན་བ, Wylie: *man ngag lta ba'i phreng ba* lists them as follows with the English rendering following Dowman (2003)[27] and Wylie following Norbu *et al.* (2001):[28]

- the 'Hedonist' or 'Chalpas' Tibetan: ཕྱལ་པ, Wylie: *phyal pa*: does not perceive, ascribe to the view or realize that all events, dharmas, etc. have a cause and an effect;

- the 'Atheist' or 'Gyangphenpas' Tibetan: རྒྱང་འཕེན་པ, Wylie: *rgyang 'phen pa*: unable to see or perceive past and future lives, the atheist toils for wealth and power in this lifetime alone. They engage in intrigue;
- the 'Nihilist' or 'Murthugpas' Tibetan: སྨུར་ཐུག་པ, Wylie: *mur thug pa*: holds that there is no causality or causal

relationship between events and dharmas. They are of the view that everything is adventitiously arisen due to chance and events and that dharmas dissipate and vanish into the void. Death is the ultimate cessation and there is no continuity between lives; and

- the 'Eternalist' or 'Mutegpas' Tibetan: མུ་སྟེགས་པ, Wylie: *mu*

stegs pa: holds to the view of an eternal, unchanging 'atman', where atman is often rendered as 'soul' in English. There is considerable diversity of the mechanics of causality with proponents of this view. Some perceive the atman as having a cause but not effect, an effect but no cause, or indeed a complex causality or causal relationship.

Lexicon: technical language and terminology

Within English Buddhist logico-epistemological discourse, there is and has been historically, much obstruction to an understanding of the Caturanta (as the Catuṣkoṭi) due to inherent negligence in terminology not being clearly defined from the outset. That said, acquisition of terminology

must be engaged and actualized though the sadhana of the 'mūla prajñā', as definitions are slippery and challenging to pinpoint that hold for all contexts. Language usage in Buddhist logic is not intuitive but technical and must be learnt, acquired through the *perfection* and *power* of 'diligence' (Sanskrit: vīrya). The following quotations are cited to provide insight (*in lieu* of

technical definitions) into the understanding of the technical Buddhist terms 'existence', 'nature', 'being', 'entity' and 'svabhava' which are all mutually qualifying.

Robinson (1957: p. 297) renders *Mūlamadhyamakakārikā* 21.14, thus:

> *"He who posits an entity becomes*

> *entangled in eternalism and annihilism, since that entity has to be either permanent or impermanent."*[29]

Robinson (1957: p. 300) in discussing the Buddhist logic of Nagarjuna, frames a view of 'svabhava':

> *Svabhava is by defini[t]ion the subject*

of contradictory ascriptions. If it exists, it must belong to an existent entity, which means that it must be conditioned, dependent on other entities, and possessed of causes. But a svabhava is by definition unconditioned, not dependent on other

> *entities, and not caused. Thus the existence of a svabhava is impossible. [NB: typographical errors repaired]*[30]

"Nature" (a gloss of prakrti which in this context equals svabhava) does not entail an alter-entity:

> *The term "nature" (prakrti equals*

svabhava) has no complement..."If (anythings) existence is due to its nature, its non-existence will not occur, since the alter-entity (complement) of a nature never occurs." (Mūlamadhyamakakāri kā, 15.8)

That is, a nature is the

> *class of properties attributed to a class of terms. Since they are necessarily present throughout the range of the subject or class of subjects, cases of their absence do not occur.*[30]

Y Karunadasa (1999, 2000: p. 1) holds that Early Buddhism and early Buddhist discourse

"often refer to the mutual opposition between two views":

- 'permanence' or 'eternalism' (Pali: *sassatavada*) also sometimes referred to as 'the belief in being' (Pali: *bhava-ditti*); and
- 'annihilation' or 'nihilism' (Pali: *ucchadevada*) also sometimes referred to as 'the belief in non-being' (Pali: *vibhava-ditti*).[31]

As Shakyamuni relates in a 'thread' (Sanskrit: *sūtra*) of discourse to Kaccānagotta in the *Kaccānagotta Sutta*, rendered into English by Myanmar Piṭaka Association Editorial Committee (1993: p. 35):

> *"For the most part, Kaccāna, sentient beings depend on two kinds of belief - belief*

> *that 'there is' (things exist) and belief that 'there is not' (things do not exist).*[32]

Y Karunadasa (1999, 2000: p. 1) states that:

> *...it is within the framework of the Buddhist critique of sassatavada and ucchadavada that the*

Buddhist doctrines seem to assume their significance. For it is through the demolition of these two world-views that Buddhism seeks to construct its own world-view. The conclusion is that it was as a critical response to the mutual opposition between these two

> *views that Buddhism emerged as a new faith amidst many other faths.*[31]

See also

Philosophy portal

- Tetralemma
- Dialetheism
- Paraconsistent logic
- Prasangika
- Two-truths doctrine

Notes

1. *Jayatilleke 1967.*
2. *Sharana., Agrawala, Vasudeva (1983). Hymn of creation : Nāsadīya sūkta, Rgveda, X. 129 (http://worldcat.org/oclc/15501476) . Prithivi Prakashan. OCLC 15501476 (https://www.worldcat.org/oclc/15501476) .*

3. *Walshe, Maurice (1987, 1995). The Long Discourses of the Buddha: A Translation of the Digha Nikaya. Boston: Wisdom Publications. ISBN 0-86171-103-3, p.81*
4. *McEvilley, Thomas (2002). The Shape of Ancient Thought. Allworth Communications. ISBN 1-58115-203-5., p.495*
5. *Rendering of the Three prajnas.*

6. *Liebenthal, Walter (1948). The Book of Chao. Peking: Gatholic University Press of Peking, 1948, p.30.*

7. *Robinson, Richard H. (1957). 'Some Logical Aspects of Nagarjuna's System'. Philosophy East & West. Volume 6, no. 4 (October 1957). University of Hawaii Press. Source: "ORIENTALIA - the Logic of Nagarjuna" (https://web.archive.org/web/20041127175124/http://www.orientalia.org/printout470.html) . Archived from the original (http://www.orientalia.org/printout470.html) on 2004-11-27. Retrieved 2009-03-21.*

(accessed: Saturday March 21, 2009), p.294

8. *Dorje, Jikdrel Yeshe (Dudjom Rinpoche, author), & translated and edited: Gyurme Dorje and Matthew Kapstein (1991). The Nyingma School of Tibetan Buddhism: Its Fundamentals and History. Boston, USA: Wisdom Publications. ISBN 0-86171-199-8, p.158*

9. *Dharma Dictionary (June, 2006). 'spros bral'. Source: [1] (http://rywiki.tsadra.org/index.php/spros_bral) Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20080709062645/http://rywiki.tsadra.org/index.php/spros_bral) 2008-07-09 at the Wayback Machine (accessed: Tuesday March 24, 2009)*

10. *Abhayadatta (author); Dowman, Keith (translator); Downs, Hugh R. (1985). Masters of Mahāmudrā (Sanskrit: Caturaśītisiddha-pravṛtti). SUNY Press. ISBN 0-88706-158-3, ISBN 978-0-88706-158-5. Source: [2] (https://books.google.com/books?id=okPNx4B1eoEC&dq=mtha%27+brgyad%3B&pg=PA397) Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20230408082449/https://books.google.com/books?id=okPNx4B1eoEC&dq=m*

tha%27+brgyad%3B&pg=PA397) 2023-04-08 at the Wayback Machine (accessed: Tuesday March 24, 2009), p.397

11. *Karmay, Samten Gyaltsen (1988). The Great Perfection (rDzogs Chen): A Philosophical and Meditative Teaching of Tibetan Buddhism. Illustrated Edition. Brill. ISBN 90-04-08792-3. Source:[3] (https://books.google.com/books?id=vM5ivXPmxwoC&dq=%22spros+bral%22+sanskrit&pg=PA118) Archived (https://web.archive.org/web/20230405024100/https://books.google.com/books?id=vM5ivXPmxwoC&dq=%22spros+bral%22+sa*

nskrit&pg=PA118) 2023-04-05 at the Wayback Machine (accessed: Tuesday March 24, 2009), p.118

12. *Jayatilleke, p. 122.*
13. *Bhaskar (1972)*
14. *Thanissaro (1997).*

15. *Robinson, Richard H. (1957). 'Some Logical Aspects of Nagarjuna's System'. Philosophy East & West. Volume 6, no. 4 (October 1957). University of Hawaii Press. Source: "ORIENTALIA - the Logic of Nagarjuna" (https://web.archive.org/web/20041127175124/http://www.orientalia.org/printout470.html) . Archived from the original (http://www.orientalia.org/printout470.html) on 2004-11-27. Retrieved 2009-03-21.*

(accessed: Saturday March 21, 2009)

16. *Stcherbatsky, Th. (1927). The Conception of Buddhist Nirvana. Leningrad: Publishing Office of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR.*
17. *Schayer, Stanislaw (1933). "Altindische Antizipationen der Aussagenlogik". Bulletin International de l'Académie Polonaise des Sciences et Philologie.* ***1933****: 99–96.*

18. *Murti, T. R. V., 1955. The Central Philosophy of Buddhism. George Allen and Unwin, London. 2nd edition: 1960.*
19. *Nakamura, Hajime (1954). "Kukao no kigo-ronrigaku-teki ketsumei, (English: 'Some Clarifications of the Concept of Voidness from the Standpoint of Symbolic Logic')" Indogaku-bukkyogaku Kenkyu, No. 5, Sept., 1954, pp. 219-231.*

20. *Robinson, Richard H. (1957). 'Some Logical Aspects of Nagarjuna's System'. Philosophy East & West. Volume 6, no. 4 (October 1957). University of Hawaii Press. Source: "ORIENTALIA - the Logic of Nagarjuna" (https://web.archive.org/web/20041127175124/http://www.orientalia.org/printout470.html) . Archived from the original (http://www.orientalia.org/printout470.html) on 2004-11-27. Retrieved 2009-03-21.*

(accessed: Saturday March 21, 2009), p,293

21. *Robinson, Richard H. (1957). 'Some Logical Aspects of Nagarjuna's System'. Philosophy East & West. Volume 6, no. 4 (October 1957). University of Hawaii Press. Source: "ORIENTALIA - the Logic of Nagarjuna" (https://web.archive.org/web/20041127175124/http://www.orientalia.org/printout470.html) . Archived from the original (http://www.orientalia.org/printout470.html) on 2004-11-27. Retrieved 2009-03-21.*

(accessed: Saturday March 21, 2009), p.296

22. *'Reality' in this context is not the Dharmakaya, but Maya, a common cultural meme within Dharmic Traditions. Refer: Reality in Buddhism.*

23. *Puhakka, Kaisa (2003). 'Awakening from the Spell of Reality: Lessons from Nāgārjuna' within: Segall, Seth Robert (2003). Encountering Buddhism: Western Psychology and Buddhist Teachings. Albany, NY, USA: State University of New York Press. ISBN 0-7914-5736-2. Source: [4] (https://www.scribd.com/doc/12834068/Encountering-Buddhism-Western-Psychology-and-Buddhist-Teachings)*

(accessed: Tuesday March 24, 2009), p.134-135

24. *Dorje, Jikdrel Yeshe (Dudjom Rinpoche, author), & translated and edited: Gyurme Dorje and Matthew Kapstein (1991). The Nyingma School of Tibetan Buddhism: Its Fundamentals and History. Boston, USA: Wisdom Publications. ISBN 0-86171-199-8, p.129*

Enumerations.

25. *'Wisdom Sūtras' is a gloss of Prajñāpāramitā Sūtras.*

26. *Dumoulin, Heinrich (author); Heisig, James W. (translator); Knitter, Paul (translator); with introduction by McCrae, John (1988, 2005). Zen Buddhism: A History; Volume 1 India and China. Bloomington, Indiana, USA: World Wisdom, Inc. ISBN 0-941532-89-5, pp.43-44*

27. *Dowman, Keith (2003, revised). Flight of the Garuda: the Dzogchen Tradition of Tibetan Buddhism. Somerville, MA, USA: Wisdom Publications. ISBN 0-86171-367-2, p.146*

28. *Norbu, Namkhai (2001). The Precious Vase: Instructions on the Base of Santi Maha Sangha. Shang Shung Edizioni. Second revised edition. p. 103. (Translated from the Tibetan, edited and annotated by Adriano Clemente with the help of the author. Translated from Italian into English by Andy Lukianowicz.). This is a restricted text.*

29. *Robinson, Richard H. (1957). 'Some Logical Aspects of Nagarjuna's System'. Philosophy East & West. Volume 6, no. 4 (October 1957). University of Hawaii Press. Source: "ORIENTALIA - the Logic of Nagarjuna" (https://web.archive.org/web/20041127175124/http://www.orientalia.org/printout470.html) . Archived from the original (http://www.orientalia.org/printout470.html) on 2004-11-27. Retrieved 2009-03-21.*

(accessed: Saturday March 21, 2009), p.297

30. *Robinson, Richard H. (1957). 'Some Logical Aspects of Nagarjuna's System'. Philosophy East & West. Volume 6, no. 4 (October 1957). University of Hawaii Press. Source: "ORIENTALIA - the Logic of Nagarjuna" (https://web.archive.org/web/20041127175124/http://www.orientalia.org/printout470.html) . Archived from the original (http://www.orientalia.org/printout470.html) on 2004-11-27. Retrieved 2009-03-21.*

(accessed: Saturday March 21, 2009), p.300

31. *Y Karunadasa (1999, 2000). "The Buddhist Critique of Sassatavada and Ucchedavada: The Key to a proper Understanding of the Origin and the Doctrines of early Buddhism." from: Y Karunadasa (1999, 2000). The Middle Way, UK, vol. 74 & 75.*

32. *Myanmar Piṭaka Association Editorial Committee (1993). Nidāna Saṃyutta: Group of Related Discourses on Causal Factors from Nidānavagga Saṃyutta: Division Containing Groups of Discourses on Causal Factors. Shakti Nagar, Delhi, India: Sri Satguru Publications. ISBN 81-7030-367-2. p.35*

References

- Robinson, R.H. (October 1957), "Some Logical Aspects

of Nagarjuna's System" (https://web.archive.org/web/20070727202331/http://buddhism.lib.ntu.edu.tw/FULLTEXT/JR-PHIL/richard2.htm), *Philosophy East and West*, Hawaii, USA: University of Hawaii Press, **6** (4): 291–308, doi:10.2307/1397476 (https://doi.org/10.2307%2F1397476), JSTOR 1397476 (https://www.jstor.org/stable/1397476), archived from the original

(http://buddhism.lib.ntu.edu.tw/FULLTEXT/JR-PHIL/richard2.htm) on 2007-07-27

- Jayatilleke, K.N. (1967), "The Logic of Four Alternatives" (https://web.archive.org/web/20110926042253/http://buddhism.lib.ntu.edu.tw/FULLTEXT/JR-PHIL/ew27056.htm), *Philosophy East and West*, Hawaii, USA: University of Hawaii Press, **17** (1–4): 69–83, doi:10.2307/1397046 (htt

ps://doi.org/10.2307%2F1397046), JSTOR 1397046 (https://www.jstor.org/stable/1397046), archived from the original (http://buddhism.lib.ntu.edu.tw/FULLTEXT/JR-PHIL/ew27056.htm) on 2011-09-26

- Matilal, B.K. (1971), *Epistemology, Logic, and Grammar in Indian Philosophical Analysis*, Paris: Mouton

- Wayman, A. (1977), "Who Understands the Four Alternatives of the Buddhist Texts?" (https://web.archive.org/web/20171107030035/http://enlight.lib.ntu.edu.tw/FULLTEXT/JR-PHIL/laex8.htm), *Philosophy East and West*, Hawaii, USA: University of Hawaii Press, **27** (1): 3–21, doi:10.2307/1397697 (https://doi.org/10.2307%2F1397697), JSTOR 1397697 (https://

www.jstor.org/stable/1397697), archived from the original (http://enlight.lib.ntu.edu.tw/FULLTEXT/JR-PHIL/laex8.htm) on 2017-11-07

- Ruegg, D.S. (September 1977), "The uses of the four positions of the Catuskoti and the problem of the description of reality in Mahāyāna Buddhism", *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, **5** (1/2): 1–71, doi:10.1007/bf02431703 (htt

ps://doi.org/10.1007%2Fbf02431703), S2CID 189832953 (https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:189832953).

- Gunaratne, R.D. (April 1980), "The Logical Form of Catuṣkoṭi: A New Solution", *Philosophy East and West*, Hawaii, USA: University of Hawaii Press, **30** (2): 211–239, doi:10.2307/1398848 (https://doi.org/10.2307%2F1398848), JSTOR 1398848 (http

s://www.jstor.org/stable/1398848)

- Bharadwaja, V.K. (July 1984), "Rationality, Argumentation and Embarrassment: A Study of Four Logical Alternatives (catuṣkoṭi) in Buddhist Logic", *Philosophy East and West*, Hawaii, USA: University of Hawaii Press, **34** (3): 303–319, doi:10.2307/1398631 (https://doi.org/10.2307%2F1398631), JSTOR 1398631 (http

s://www.jstor.org/stable/1398631)

- Gunaratne, R.D. (July 1986), "Understanding Naagaarjuna's catuskoti" (https://web.archive.org/web/20171107030035/http://enlight.lib.ntu.edu.tw/FULLTEXT/JR-PHIL/laex8.htm), *Philosophy East and West*, Hawaii, USA: University of Hawaii Press, **36** (3): 213–234, doi:10.2307/1398772 (https://doi.org/10.2307%2F139

8772), JSTOR 1398772 (https://www.jstor.org/stable/1398772), archived from the original (http://enlight.lib.ntu.edu.tw/FULLTEXT/JR-PHIL/laex8.htm) on 2017-11-07

- Westerhoff, J. (2006), "Nagarjuna's catuskoti" (https://web.archive.org/web/20191220032646/https://philarchive.org/archive/WESNCK-2), *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, **34** (4): 367–395,

doi:10.1007/s10781-005-6172-4 (https://doi.org/10.1007%2Fs10781-005-6172-4), S2CID 169456015 (https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:169456015), archived from the original (https://philarchive.org/archive/WESNCK-2) on 2019-12-20, retrieved 2019-12-20

Retrieved from "https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php

?title=Catuşkoţi&oldid=1160946303"

WIKIPEDIA
This page was last edited on 19 June 2023, at 17:53 (UTC). •
Content is available under CC BY-SA 4.0 unless otherwise noted.